

Towards Automated Generation of Scripted Dialogue: Some Time-Honoured Strategies

Paul Piwek and Kees van Deemter

ITRI – University of Brighton
Watts Building, Moulsecoomb
Brighton BN2 4GJ
UK

Email: Paul.Piwek@itri.bton.ac.uk Kees.van.Deemter@itri.bton.ac.uk

Abstract

The main aim of this paper is to introduce automated generation of scripted dialogue as a worthwhile topic of investigation. In particular the fact that scripted dialogue involves two layers of communication, i.e., uni-directional communication between the author and the audience of a scripted dialogue and bi-directional pretended communication between the characters featuring in the dialogue, is argued to raise some interesting issues. Our hope is that the combined study of the two layers will forge links between research in text generation and dialogue processing. The paper presents a first attempt at creating such links by studying three types of strategies for the automated generation of scripted dialogue. The strategies are derived from examples of human-authored and naturally occurring dialogue.

1 Introduction

By a scripted dialogue we mean a dialogue which is performed by two or more agents on the basis of a description of that dialogue. This description, i.e., the script, specifies the actions which are performed in the course of the dialogue and their temporal ordering. We assume that the script is created in advance by an author. Automated generation of scripted dialogue involves a computer programme in the role of the author and execution of the script by software agents. André et al. (2000) coin the term ‘presentation team’ for such a collection of software agents. In their words, presentation teams ‘[...] rather than addressing the user directly—convey information in the style of performances to be observed by the user’ (André et al., 2000:220).

The plan of this paper is to first motivate why the study of scripted dialogues is interest-

ing and useful, whilst also pointing out the limitations and complications of scripted dialogue. We then present a number of strategies for the automated generation of scripted dialogue. Our discussion is illustrated by means of some extracts from mainly scripted dialogues. The paper concludes with a brief overview of the ongoing NECA project in which scripted dialogues are presented by embodied conversational agents.

2 Prospects and Problems

Scripted dialogues have interesting features, both from a theoretical and a practical point of view. Let us start by highlighting A theoretical issue. Scripted dialogues involves two layers of communication. First, in a scripted dialogue there is a layer at which the participants of the dialogue *mimic* communication with each other. The communication is not real because the actions of the participants are based on a script; the participants do not interpret the actions of the other participants in order to determine their own actions. Second, there is a layer of uni-directional communication from the author of the script to the audience of the dialogue. At this level, a scripted dialogue is very much like a monologue. Thus scripted dialogue presents a challenge because it requires simultaneous generation of a layer of real and one of pretended communication, each layer having its own participants with their (real or pretended) goals, beliefs, desires, personalities, etc.

Also from a practical point of view scripted dialogue has something to offer. Before we go into its advantages, let us, however, first discuss a feature of scripted dialogue which might be perceived as one of its limitations. There is a class of applications which requires the generation of dialogue about a subject matter that evolves in real-time. For such applications

scripted dialogue is not possible. For instance, André et al. (2000)'s dialogues between two reporters about a live transmission of a ROBOCUP soccer event cannot be implemented as scripted dialogue: the verbal reports of the agents are determined to a large extent by events which evolve in real-time. Hence it is impossible to script the verbal reports in advance. Similarly, automatically generated scripted dialogues do not lend themselves well to user involvement in the dialogue: because the script is created in advance there is no scope for reaction to the user's contributions.

These limitations are, however, offset by a large number of benefits. Firstly, it should be noted that for large scale applications it has been argued that a combination of scripted and autonomous behaviours is required. For instance, in the MRE project at USC¹ a combination of autonomous and scripted virtual humans is used to create a realistic training environment. Thus applications do not necessarily force a strict choice between autonomous and scripted behaviour (more specifically dialogue).

Secondly, staying within the education/training domain it should be noted that in the literature on Intelligent Tutoring Systems (ITS) a case has been made for so-called vicarious learning (e.g., Lee et al., 1998; Cox et al., 1999): learning by watching dialogues of other people being taught or engaged in a learning process. Various studies have been carried out in this area and some positive effects of vicarious learning by overhearing dialogue (as opposed to monologue) have been found (see Scott et al., 2000).

Thirdly, there is a large class of obvious applications for scripted dialogues. The dialogue in film scenes, commercials, plays, product demonstrations, etc. can be treated as scripted dialogue. These are examples of situations in which real-time interaction with the environment or a user are not required.

Finally, there is not only a wide range of potential applications for scripted dialogue, but applying scripted dialogues also has some distinct advantages over relying on dialogue generated by autonomous agents:

1. The generation of a scripted dialogue

¹See, e.g., Rickel et al. (2002).

requires no potentially complicated and error-prone interpretation of the dialogue acts produced by other autonomous agents.

2. More time is available for the generation process, because scripted dialogue is not generated in real time.
3. Not only more time but also more information is available to the generation process of scripted dialogue. Whereas in spontaneous dialogue an individual action can only be constructed using information about the actions which temporally precede it, in scripted dialogue an action can be tailored to both the actions which precede and those which follow it.
4. It is much easier to create dialogues with certain global properties (e.g., a certain pattern of turn-taking), because the dialogue is constructed by a single author. In spontaneous dialogue, such properties emerge out of the autonomous actions of the participants, which makes it difficult to control them directly.

3 Strategies for Scripted Dialogue Generation

We have already pointed out that in one important respect scripted dialogue resembles monologue: information flows from a single author to an audience. Hovy (1988) was one of the first to systematically consider how the (communicative) goals of an author can be related to various strategies for communicating information through a monologue. In particular, he describes a natural language generation (NLG) system (PAULINE) which implements a number of such strategies. He thereby abandoned an assumption which was and still is implicit in many NLG systems, namely that a text is generated from a database of facts and that the task is mainly one of mapping these facts onto declarative sentences which express them. Hovy's work on the influence of pragmatic factors on natural language generation is currently followed up by various researchers involved in building embodied conversational agents (for a bibliography of recent work in this newly emerging area of natural language generation see Piwek, 2002).

The new picture that emerges is one where an author uses a text as a device for influencing

the attitudes of his or her audience. Amongst the attitudes which an author might want to influence are the beliefs, intentions (plans for action), goals, desires and opinions (judgements about whether something is good, bad or neutral) of the audience. All of the aforementioned attitudes are *about* something (that is, they are intentional; see, for instance, Searle, 1983). Roughly speaking, one can discern attitudes which are about the subject matter/topic of a text and those which pertain to the context (e.g., the author, the audience and the relation between the two). Attitudes about the context are normally communicated implicitly. Hovy discusses how style (formal, informal, forceful) can be used to do so. Generally speaking, everything that is discussed explicitly in a text is part of its subject matter. Thus, whenever contextual aspects are discussed explicitly (e.g., ‘I am your boss, therefore listen to what I have to say’), they become also part of the subject matter. This leaves us with a class of information that is neither discussed explicitly (and therefore not part of the subject matter) and is neither part of the context. For instance, take an opinion about a person which can be expressed explicitly as in ‘X is a bad guy’, but also implicitly as in ‘X killed John’.²

Scripted dialogue offers the same communicative opportunities (i.e., for communicating facts and influencing an audience in other ways) as ordinary text, plus a number of other ones in addition. To illustrate some of the issues, let us summarize one of the first dialogues written by the humanist philosopher Erasmus of Rotterdam in 1522 (Erasmus, 1522).³

- E1
1. A: Where have you been?
 2. C: I was off to Jerusalem on pilgrimage.
 3. A: Why?
 4. C: Why do others go?
 5. A: Out of folly if I’m not mistaken.
 6. C: That’s right; glad I’m not the only one though.
 7. A: Was the trip worthwhile?

²Hovy (1988) discusses how reporting that a person is the actor of an action which is generally considered to be bad can be used to implicitly convey the opinion that the person is bad.

³Large parts of the dialogue were omitted, reworded, or summarized, since we will be focusing on a specific set of issues. The (very tentative) translation is our own.

8. C: No.
9. A: What did you see?
10. C: Pilgrims causing mayhem.
11. A: Were you morally uplifted?
13. C: No, not at all.
14. A: Did you get richer?
15. C: No, quite the contrary.
16. A: Was there nothing good about the trip then?
17. C: Yes, in fact there was. In particular, I can now entertain others with my lies, like other pilgrims do.
18. A: But that’s not very decent, is it? [...]
19. C: True. But I may also be able to talk others out of the idea of pilgrimage.
20. A: I wish you had talked *me* out of it.
21. C: What? Have you been as stupid as I?
22. A: I’ve been to Rome and Santiago de Compostela.
23. C: Why?
24. A: Out of folly I guess [because ...]
25. C: So why did you do it?
26. A: My friends and I vowed to go when we were drunk.
27. C: Surely a decision worth taking when you’re drunk [...]
Did everyone arrive back home safely?
28. A: All except three: Two died; the third we left but he’s probably in heaven now.
29. C: Why? Was he so pious?
30. A: No, he was a scoundrel.
31. C: Then why is he in heaven?
32. A: Because he had plenty of letters of indulgence with him [...]
33. A: Don’t get me wrong: I’m not against letters of indulgence but I have more admiration for someone who leads a virtuous life. Incidentally, when do we go to these parties that you mentioned?
34. C: Let’s go as soon as we can, and add to other pilgrims’ lies.

The central question that we will start addressing in this paper is ‘what strategies for influencing the attitudes of the audience are specific to scripted dialogue?’ A number of these strate-

gies will be introduced below. We will return to Erasmus' dialogue at various points in our discussion and highlight parts of the dialogue which illustrate the aforementioned strategies.

3.1 Strategies of information distribution

As we have seen, the main difference between monologue and scripted dialogue is that the latter communicates with the audience *via* the (pretended) communication between the dialogue participants. This has a number of immediate effects:

1. The author can let a participant say something without being directly responsible for the content.
2. Each participant can represent a particular chunk of information, making the combined content more easily digestible.
3. In particular, the participants can represent different points of view on the same subject matter, which may even be inconsistent with each other.
4. One participant may express an opinion concerning something the other participant has raised.

Point 1 was clearly relevant to Erasmus, in whose case direct criticism of the Catholic church could have made him a target for the Inquisition. (A's last utterance seems intended to further milden any criticism.) *Point 2* is relevant because each of the two participants represents a particular journey. Both journeys could have been related in one monologue, but this might have led to confusion and would certainly have been less exciting to read. In fact, it is patently clear from reading the whole dialogue that one participant's questions are used for making more lively what would otherwise have been a story with some rather boring parts.

Point 3 is not directly relevant in the case of the present dialogue but the very fact that both participants agree on all essentials can only reinforce the strengths of Erasmus' implied position. (See also under Strategies of Emphasis.) *Point 4* is relevant again, since both participants frequently express evaluative opinions concerning various elements of the two stories. In many cases, evaluative opinions are expressed

in highly indirect fashion, and this brings us to a second class of strategies.

3.2 Strategies of association

One way to influence the attitude of the audience about, for instance, a person is to mention the person in combination with something else to which the audience already has the intended attitude. Hovy (1988) suggests, for example, that we can make somebody look good, bad or neutral by presenting him or her as the actor of an action which is generally (or specifically by the audience) perceived to be good, bad or neutral, respectively: "Mike killed Jim" makes Mike look bad, whereas "Mike rescued Jim" makes him look good.

In fact, this strategy seems to be an instance of a more generally applicable strategy: *To convey that X has property P, one can present X in combination with something which has or implies property P.* Thus, to convey that Mike is a clever guy we might say "Mike managed to solve this partial differential equation in no time", i.e., Mike is presented as being able to solve a difficult problem quickly, which implies being clever.

Information conveyed in a text is not only presented in the context of other information which can influence its interpretation but also *by* the author (and possibly speaker) of the text. If any properties of this author/speaker are known, these can rub off on the points s/he is trying to make. The appeal to this tendency in an argument is considered to be a fallacy (Argumentum ad Hominem). For instance, one might argue that Bacon's philosophy is untrustworthy because he was removed from his chancellorship for dishonesty (Copi, 1972:72).

Scripted dialogue lends it particularly well to this type of association. The presence of the second layer of communication allows the author to distribute communicative acts over characters which were conceived by the author. These characters can be given certain traits which influence the interpretation by the audience of what they say in the dialogue. These traits can be conveyed by various means. In the case of Erasmus' dialogue, the fact that the protagonists and their pilgrim friends are avid partygoers – evidently something Erasmus didn't approve of – is used to discredit their pilgrimage. If the dialogue is enacted by a

collection of embodied agents, their physical appearance can be used. Alternatively, certain characteristics of the dialogue can also suggest a particular property. For instance, Thomas (1989) discusses various ways in which a speaker can come across as dominant or an authority (interruptions, abrupt changes of topic, marking new stages in the interaction, metadiscoursal comments, etc.). The following is an example of a marking of a new stage in the interaction taken from Thomas (1989:146):

- E2 A: Okay that's that part. The next part what I want to deal with is your suitability to remain as a CID officer.

3.3 Strategies of emphasis

For various reasons, an author might want to highlight certain information and suppress other information. In a monologue, repetition of information signals emphasis. For instance, de Rosis and Grasso (2000) analyse an explanation text about drug prescription and point out that certain information is rather redundant, i.e., repeated with identical or equivalent wording such as:

- E3 "The good is news is that we do have tablets that are very effective for treating TB", and "but it is something we can do something about".

Here it seems that positive information is repeated intentionally. In dialogue, repetition can be achieved naturally due to the presence of two interlocutors at the second layer of communication. Consider the dialogue fragment below from Twain (1917:11) between a young man and an old man.

- E4 1. Y.M. What detail is that?
 2. O.M. The impulse which moves a person to do things – the only impulse that ever moves a person to do a thing.
 3. Y.M. The *only* one! Is there but one?
 4. O.M. That is all. There is only one.
 5. Y.M. Well, certainly that is a strange enough doctrine. What is the sole impulse that ever moves a person to do a thing?

6. O.M. The impulse to *content his own spirit* – the *necessity* of contending his own spirit and *winning its approval*.

Here turns 3. and 4., which form a subdialogue, are both about the claim that there is *only one* impulse which moves a person to do things. Now imagine that we have an algorithm which has already distributed the information which it wants to get across to the audience amongst the dialogue participants. Let us call this step I. During step II, the algorithm will determine how this information can be conveyed through a sequence of turns. To generate E4, we might at this stage produce the sequence: 1., 2., 5., 6. Step III would involve the addition of further turns for the purpose of emphasizing information. During step III, such an algorithm could insert subdialogues like the one above (3., 4.), if there are any matters which need particular emphasis.

Note that Erasmus also employs this strategy. For instance, in Erasmus' Dialogue (E1), the turns 4. and 5. form a subdialogue which a system like the one proposed here could insert during step III, after already having created the sequence 1., 2., 3., 6., ...

Note that the sketched approach presupposes that realization (both verbal and non-verbal) is performed only after steps I – III; during steps I – III the algorithm manipulates abstract descriptions of the semantic and pragmatic content of the utterances. The reason for this is that before step III, the algorithm can not yet know whether to realize the beginning of turn 6. as 'That's right' or 'Out of folly', since this depends on whether the subdialogue (4., 5.) is inserted or not.

4 Application in the NECA project

The work reported in this paper is carried out in the context of the NECA project which started in October 2001 and has a duration of 2.5 years.⁴ In this project a system is being built that can generate scripted dialogues that are subsequently performed by animated human-like

⁴NECA stands for Net Environment for Embodied Emotional Conversational Agents. The project is funded by the EC. The partners in the project are: DFKI, IPUS (University of the Saarland), ITRI (University of Brighton), ÖFAI, Freeserve and Sysis AG. Further details can be found at <http://www.ai.univie.ac.at/NECA/>.

characters. One prototype to be delivered by NECA is an electronic showroom (eShowroom).⁵ The idea is that a user/customer can select a class of cars and/or attributes (friendly for the environment, luxury, sportiness, etc.) in which s/he is interested. Furthermore, the user can set the personality traits of the characters which are to discuss this car (introverted, extroverted, agreeable, etc.). On the basis of these settings, the system then produces dialogues about specific cars and presents these to the user by means of embodied conversational agents which play out the dialogue. The strategies discussed in the present paper are highly relevant in the context of car sales. For example,

- Information about cars can be complex, so it can be useful to have one or more participants ask clarification questions (somewhat in the style of Conan Doyle’s Watson character, who triggers Sherlock Holmes into explanations that benefit us as readers).
- Not all customers are alike and it can be useful to let different types of customers be represented by different animated characters: one who is primarily interested in the performance of the car, one who is interested in chrome and gloss, one who is very aware of environmental and safety-related issues, etc.

Let us describe in more detail how one of the strategies of emphasis will be implemented in the NECA system. The NECA system generates the interaction between two or more characters in a number of steps, where information flows from a Scene Generator to a Multi-modal Natural Language Generator, to a Speech Synthesis component, to a Gesture Assignment component, and finally to a media player.

In the Scene Generator, the basic structure of the dialogue is determined. For this purpose, a top-down planning algorithm is used. The output of this module is a RRL Scene Description (see Piwek et al., 2002). Amongst other things, this Scene Description contains a set of dialogue acts. Individual dialogue acts are specified in terms of the dialogue act type, the speaker, the addressees, the semantic content, the actions

which the act is a reaction to, and the and emotions (felt and expressed). The temporal ordering amongst the dialogue acts is represented separately and allows for underspecification.

A Scene Description is constructed stepwise. We might start by constructing the following dialogue fragment:⁶

E5 x_1 B: How fast is this car?
 x_2 S: Its top speed is 180mph.
 x_2 B: Wow, that’s great.

At this point, further elaboration of the dialogue is possible. Assume, for example, that the positive information that the car has a top speed of 180mph is to be emphasized. For this purpose, the strategy of emphasis we discussed in section 3.3 can be employed: a subdialogue can be inserted after x_2 consisting of a question by the buyer (‘As much as 180mph?’) which provides the seller with the opportunity to repeat a positive piece of information. This procedure yields the following ‘enhanced’ dialogue:

E6 x_1 B: How fast is this car?
 x_2 S: Its top speed is 180mph.
 y_1 B: As much as 180mph?
 y_2 S: Yes, no less than 180 mph.
 x_2 B: Wow, that’s great.

Note that the information which required emphasis has been mentioned no less than three times in the dialogue. This has been achieved by exploiting a very natural dialogue phenomenon: the occurrence of confirmation subdialogues.

The thus created abstract representation of the dialogue (the Scene Description) can subsequently be processed further by the Multi-modal Natural Language Generator, the Speech Synthesis component, and the Gesture Assignment component. The result is sent to a media player which displays the dialogue to the user by means of a collection of embodied conversational characters.

5 Conclusions

We are not aware of any work which lays out strategies for the automated generation of

⁵This application builds on the work carried out at DFKI and reported in André et al. (2000).

⁶In reality, at this stage in the processing linguistic realization has not yet taken place; thus the texts in E5. should be understood as mere paraphrases of the abstract descriptions of the dialogue acts which are actually passed on.

scripted dialogue. There is a rapidly growing body of work on (Embodied) Conversational Agents (see, e.g., Ball & Breeze, 1998; De Carolis et al., 2001; Loyall & Bates, 1997; Nitta et al., 1997; Prendinger & Ishizuka, 2001; Walker et al., 1996 and Zinn et al., 2002), but to the extent that language generation is discussed there⁷, it is from the perspective of the agents who participate in the conversation, rather than from the perspective of an author who produces a script for their interaction. The only exception we came across is André et al. (2000) which reports on implemented systems for both spontaneous and scripted dialogue. Our aim has been to take a step back from the domain-specific implementation which they propose and find out whether it is possible to first identify more general strategies which are valid for the automated generation of scripted dialogue. We have tried to find such strategies on the basis of examples of human-authored and naturally occurring dialogues. We hope that our tentative investigations will encourage further studies into this new topic. A topic which, in our opinion, harbours interesting research questions at the intersection between dialogue processing and text generation, and which also lends itself well for various types of practical applications.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Alexandre Direne, Martin Klesen and Neil Tipper for comments on an earlier draft of this paper, and two anonymous reviewers for their comments and encouragement. This research is supported by the EC Project NECA IST-2000-28580. The information in this document is provided as is and no guarantee or warranty is given that the information is fit for any particular purpose. The user thereof uses the information at its sole risk and liability.

References

- André, E., T. Rist, S. van Mulken, M. Klesen & S. Baldes (2000). 'The Automated Design of Believable Dialogues for Animated Presentation Teams'. In: J. Cassell, J. Sullivan, S. Prevost and E. Churchill, *Embodied Conversational Agents*, MIT Press, 220-255.
- Ball, G. & J. Breeze (1998). 'Emotion and Personality in a Conversational Character'. In: *Proceedings of the Workshop on Embodied Conversational Characters*, Lake Tahoe, CA, 1998, 83-86.
- Cox, R., J. McKendree, R. Tobin, J. Lee & T. Mayes (1999). 'Vicarious learning from dialogue and discourse'. *Instructional Science*, 27, 431-458.
- Copi, Irving M. (1972). *Introduction to Logic: Fourth Edition*. Macmillan, New York.
- de Carolis, B., V. Carofiglio, C. Pelachaud & I. Poggi (2001). 'Interactive Information Presentation by an Embodied Animated Agent'. In: *Proceedings of the International Workshop on Information Presentation and Natural Multimodal Dialogue*, Verona, Italy, 14-15 December 2001, 19-23.
- Erasmus, Desiderius (1522). *Colloquia*.
- Hovy, Eduard H. (1988). *Generating Natural Language Under Pragmatic Constraints*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, New Jersey.
- Lee, J., F. Dineen, J. McKendree (1998). 'Supporting student discussions: it isn't just talk'. *Education and Information Technologies*, 3, 217-229.
- Loyall, A.B. & J. Bates (1997). 'Personality-Rich Believable Agents That Use Language'. In: *Proceedings of the first International Conference on Autonomous Agents*, Marina Beach Marriott Hotel, Marina del Rey, California, February 5-8, 1997.
- Nitta, K., O. Hasegawa, T. Akiba, T. Kamishima, T. Kurita, S. Hayamizu, K. Itoh, M. Ishizuka, H. Dohi, and M. Okamura (1997). 'An Experimental Multimodal Disputation System'. In: *Proc. of the IJCAI-97 Workshop on Intelligent Multimodal Systems*, Nagoya, 1997.
- Piwek, P. (2002). 'An Annotated Bibliography of Affective Natural Language Generation'. *ITRI Technical Report ITRI-02-02*, University of Brighton. (available at: <http://www.itri.bton.ac.uk/~Paul.Piwek>)
- Piwek, P., B. Krenn, M. Schröder, M. Grice, S. Baumann & H. Pirker (2002). 'RRL: A Rich Representation Language for the Description of Agent Behaviour in NECA'. In: *Proceedings of the AAMAS workshop "Embodied conversational agents - let's specify and evaluate them!"*, 16 July 2002, Bologna, Italy.
- Prendinger, H. & M. Ishizuka (2001). 'Agents That Talk Back (Sometimes): Filter Programs for Affective Communication'. Contribution to: *Second Workshop on Attitude, Personality and Emotions in User-adapted Interaction* (in conjunction with User Modeling 2001), Sonthofen, Germany, July 13, 2001.
- Rickel, J., S. Marsella, J. Gratch, R. Hill, D. Traum & W. Swartout (2002). 'Toward a New Generation of Virtual Humans for Interactive Experiences'. *IEEE Intelligent Systems*, July/August 2002.
- de Rosi, F. & F. Grasso (2000). 'Affective Natural Language Generation'. In: A.M. Paiva (Ed.), *Affective Interactions*, Springer Lecture Notes in AI 1814, 204-218.

⁷See Piwek (2002) for an overview of the literature in this area, specifically on affective natural language generation.

- Scott, D.C., B. Gholson, M. Ventura, A.C. Graesser and the Tutoring Research Group (2000). 'Overhearing Dialogues and Monologues in Virtual Tutoring Sessions: Effects on Questioning and Vicarious Learning'. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 11, 242-253.
- Searle, John R. (1983). *Intentionality*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Thomas, Jenny A. (1989). 'Discourse control in confrontational interaction'. In: L. Hickey (ed.), *The Pragmatics of Style*, Routledge, London and New York.
- Twain, Mark (1917). *What is man? And other essays*. Chatto & Windus, London.
- Walker, M.A., J.E. Cahn & S.J. Whittaker (1996). 'Linguistic Style Improvisation for Lifelike Computer Characters'. In: *Proceedings of the AAAI Workshop on AI, Artificial Life and Entertainment*, Portland.
- Zinn, Claus, Johanna D. Moore, & Mark G. Core (2002). 'A 3-tier Planning Architecture for Managing Tutorial Dialogue', To appear in: *Proceeding of Intelligent Tutoring Systems, Sixth International Conference (ITS 2002)*, Biarritz, France, June 2002.